

# SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress  
1st Session

Vote No. 479

September 29, 1995, 6:34 p.m.  
Page S-14640 Temp. Record

## COMMERCE-JUSTICE-STATE APPROPRIATIONS/Bosnia, Congressional Approval

**SUBJECT:** Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1996 . . . H.R. 2076. Gregg amendment No. 2843.

### ACTION: AMENDMENT AGREED TO, 94-2

**SYNOPSIS:** As reported, H.R. 2076, the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996, will provide a total of \$26.525 billion in new budget authority, which is 1 percent less than provided for fiscal year (FY) 1995, and which is \$4.634 billion less than the Administration requested. The Justice Department and the Judiciary will receive substantial increases in funding, and the Commerce Department, the State Department, and related agencies will receive substantial reductions in funding.

**The Gregg amendment** would express the sense of the Senate that funds from this Act should not be used to deploy combat-equipped U.S. forces in Bosnia and Herzegovina unless:

- 1) Congress gave advance approval for such deployment; or
- 2) a temporary deployment of such forces was necessary: to evacuate United Nations peace-keeping forces from a situation of imminent danger; to undertake emergency air rescue operations; or to provide for the airborne delivery of humanitarian supplies.

If a temporary deployment were made, the President would notify Congress as soon as practicable, though no later than 48 hours after the start of the deployment.

**Those favoring** the amendment contended:

The United States is currently attempting to negotiate a peace settlement of the ongoing conflict in Bosnia. President Clinton has repeatedly stated that he would, under certain circumstances, send up to 25,000 U.S. soldiers to serve on the ground in Bosnia. The

(See other side)

YEAS (94)				NAYS (2)		NOT VOTING (4)	
Republican (52 or 100%)		Democrats (42 or 95%)		Republicans (0 or 0%)	Democrats (2 or 5%)	Republicans (2)	Democrats (2)
Abraham	Hutchison	Akaka	Inouye		Exon	Bennett <sup>-2</sup>	Glenn <sup>-2</sup>
Ashcroft	Inhofe	Baucus	Kennedy		Simon	Shelby <sup>-2</sup>	Johnston <sup>-2</sup>
Bond	Jeffords	Biden	Kerrey				
Brown	Kassebaum	Bingaman	Kerry				
Burns	Kempthorne	Boxer	Kohl				
Campbell	Kyl	Bradley	Lautenberg				
Chafee	Lott	Breaux	Leahy				
Coats	Lugar	Bryan	Levin				
Cochran	Mack	Bumpers	Lieberman				
Cohen	McCain	Byrd	Mikulski				
Coverdell	McConnell	Conrad	Moseley-Braun				
Craig	Murkowski	Daschle	Moynihan				
D'Amato	Nickles	Dodd	Murray				
DeWine	Packwood	Dorgan	Nunn				
Dole	Pressler	Feingold	Pell				
Domenici	Roth	Feinstein	Pryor				
Faircloth	Santorum	Ford	Reid				
Frist	Simpson	Graham	Robb				
Gorton	Smith	Harkin	Rockefeller				
Gramm	Snowe	Heflin	Sarbanes				
Grams	Specter	Hollings	Wellstone				
Grassley	Stevens						
Gregg	Thomas						
Hatch	Thompson						
Hatfield	Thurmond						
Helms	Warner						

#### EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

- 1—Official Business
- 2—Necessarily Absent
- 3—Illness
- 4—Other

#### SYMBOLS:

- AY—Announced Yea  
AN—Announced Nay  
PY—Paired Yea  
PN—Paired Nay

possibility that a settlement may be reached that will include a requirement that the U.S. send soldiers to Bosnia has prompted us to offer the Gregg amendment.

This amendment would express the sense of the Senate that President Clinton should not commit ground troops to Bosnia without prior congressional approval unless an emergency deployment were necessary. This sense-of-the-Senate statement was carefully crafted to meet the concerns of Senators of very divergent viewpoints. At one extreme, we have Senators who believe that the President does not need any approval to involve U.S. forces in combat, but who nevertheless believe that it would be advantageous if the President were to receive prior congressional approval. On the other extreme, we have Senators who believe that the President has no unilateral right to commit U.S. forces to combat except in extreme situations, and then for only very limited periods of time before congressional approval must be obtained. These Senators agree with the Gregg amendment that the President should seek congressional approval, and they also believe that he constitutionally must seek such approval.

On one point all Senators should agree--it is advantageous to know the nature of any U.S. military involvement before the United States commits to that involvement, no matter who makes the commitment. For example, the Government, and the citizens of the United States, should understand why a commitment to use military force is in the United States' interest to make. They should also understand the risks involved, the likely length of the conflict, the goals, the cost, the likelihood of success, and the ease with which the United States could end its involvement. In this particular situation, we think it is also very important: to consider whether the peace agreement will have enforceable boundaries; to establish clear rules of engagement; and to forbid any United Nations control over the forces. If these conditions are met, we may approve of the limited use of U.S. combat forces in Bosnia. Expressing the sense of the Senate in favor of this amendment implicitly assumes that these issues will be thoroughly aired in Congress before approval is given.

Some Senators believe that agreeing to this amendment would make the prospects of reaching a peace agreement less likely. We disagree. By voting overwhelmingly to adopt the Gregg amendment, the negotiators of that agreement will be given a very clear signal of the terms Congress is willing to accept. Removing uncertainty from negotiations cannot help but move them forward.

Recent military actions in Bosnia have made it more likely that a lasting settlement may soon be reached. Agreeing to the Gregg amendment will make it even more likely that a lasting settlement will soon be reached, plus it will make it more certain that the United States fully understands its goals and the risks involved before committing troops. Both results are desirable, so we are pleased to vote in favor of this amendment.

**Those opposing the amendment contended:**

This amendment may be non-binding, but it will be perceived by negotiators as an attempt to restrict the U.S. options. Any restriction on the ongoing negotiations will make it less likely that they will succeed. We are deeply desirous of those negotiations succeeding; therefore, we must vote against this amendment.